

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORKMARIA ENGBRECHT, *et al.*,

Plaintiff,

-against-

MAHATTAN HELICOPTERS LLC, *et al.*,

Defendants.

USDC SDNY  
DOCUMENT  
ELECTRONICALLY FILED  
DOC #: 1/31/2019  
DATE FILED: 1/31/2019

18cv02731 (DF)

**ORDER OF  
DISMISSAL****DEBRA FREEMAN, United States Magistrate Judge:**

In this action under the Fair Labor Standards Act, the New York Labor Law, and California Labor Law, which is before this Court on the consent of the parties pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c), the parties, having reached an agreement in principle to resolve the action, have placed their proposed settlement agreement before this Court for approval. *See Cheeks v. Freeport Pancake House, Inc.*, 796 F.3d 1999 (2d Cir. 2015) (requiring judicial fairness review of FLSA settlements). The parties have also submitted a letter to the Court, explaining why they believe the proposed settlement agreement is fair, reasonable, and adequate. (Dkt. 25.) This Court has reviewed the parties' submissions in order to determine whether the proposed agreement (Dkt. 25-1) represents a reasonable compromise of the claims asserted in this action, and, in light of the totality of the relevant circumstances, including the representations made in the parties' letter, the terms of the proposed settlement agreement, and this Court's own familiarity with this matter, it is hereby ORDERED that:

1. The Court finds that the terms of the proposed settlement agreement are fair, reasonable, and adequate, both to redress Plaintiffs' claims in this action and to compensate Plaintiffs' counsel for their legal fees, and the agreement is therefore approved.

2. The Court notes that annexed to the proposed settlement agreement as Exhibit A is a proposed Stipulation and Order of Dismissal with Prejudice, which the parties have executed and have asked this Court to sign. That stipulation and proposed order recites that “[t]his Court shall retain jurisdiction to enforce the parties’ Settlement Agreement.” (*Id.*) The proposed settlement agreement also explicitly contemplates that, provided this Court accepts jurisdiction, “[v]enue for any dispute between the Parties shall lie in [this Court].” (Dkt. 25-1 (proposed settlement agreement ¶ 7).) In light of the parties’ stipulation, and in order to effectuate their evident intent, this Court will retain jurisdiction over this matter for the purpose of enforcing the settlement.

3. As a result of the Court’s approval of the parties’ executed settlement agreement, this action is hereby discontinued with prejudice and without costs or fees to any party. The Clerk of Court is directed to close this case on the Docket of the Court.

Dated: New York, New York  
January 31, 2019

SO ORDERED

  
DEBRA FREEMAN  
United States Magistrate Judge

Copies to:

All counsel (via ECF)